

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-20 are pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 8 are independent. By the instant amendment, claims 1 and 8 are amended. No new matter is added, and support for the amendments to claims 1 and 8 can be found in the application as originally filed. *See, e.g., paragraph [0049] of the published application, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0041783 A1.*

Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-20 are presented for further prosecution on the merits.

A. Introduction

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final:

1. claims 1, 8 and 12-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0217932 to Nally et al. ("the Nally et al. reference") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,030,848 to Sato et al. ("the Sato et al. reference");
2. claims 3-5, 7, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Nally et al. and Sato et al. references, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,841,492 to Iwauchi et al. ("the Iwauchi et al. reference"); and
3. claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Nally et al., Sato et al. and Iwauchi et al. references, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,131,736 to Alvarez ("the Alvarez reference").

B. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1, 8, and 12-20

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final, claims 1, 8, and 12-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Nally et al. reference in view of the Sato et al. reference. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 presently recites, *inter alia*,

the driver is configured to regulate a luminance of the display by controlling a ratio of a duration of the display period to a duration of the first and second no-light display periods, and

the driver is configured to regulate a brightness of the display by controlling a duration of the white light display period.

Independent claim 8 recites similar subject matter to that recited in claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Nally et al. and Sato et al. references, whether

considered individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, claims 1 and 8, as well as claims 12-20 depending respectively therefrom, are allowable over the Nally et al. and Sato et al. references. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that this rejection be favorably reconsidered and withdrawn.

C. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claims 3-5, 7, 10 and 11

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final, claims 3-5, 7, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Nally et al. and Sato et al. references, and further in view of the Iwauchi et al. reference. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Iwauchi et al. reference fails to teach the subject matter noted above as missing from the Nally et al. and Sato et al. references. Accordingly, the asserted combination of the Nally et al., Sato et al. and Iwauchi et al. references fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of the rejected claims. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that this rejection be favorably reconsidered and withdrawn.

D. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claim 6

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Nally et al., Sato et al. and Iwauchi et al. references, and further in view of the Alvarez reference. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Alvarez reference fails to teach the subject matter noted above as missing from the Nally et al., Sato et al. and Iwauchi et al. references. Accordingly, the asserted combination of the Nally et al., Sato et al., Iwauchi et al. and Alvarez references fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of the rejected claim. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that this rejection be favorably reconsidered and withdrawn.

E. Conclusion

The above remarks demonstrate the failings of the outstanding rejections, and are sufficient to overcome them. However, while these remarks may refer to particular claim elements, they are not intended to, nor need they, comprehensively address each and every reason for the patentability of the claimed subject matter over the applied art. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable for reasons including, but not limited to, those set forth above, and patentability of the claims does not depend solely on the particular claim elements discussed above.

If the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this application is earnestly solicited, and an early and favorable further action upon all the claims is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE & MORSE, P.C.

Date: July 2, 2008


Eugene M. Lee, Reg. No. 32,039

LEE & MORSE, P.C.
3141 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE, SUITE 500
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042
703.207.0008 TEL
703.207.0003 FAX

PETITION and
DEPOSIT ACCOUNT CHARGE AUTHORIZATION

This document and any concurrently filed papers are believed to be timely. Should any extension of the term be required, applicant hereby petitions the Director for such extension and requests that any applicable petition fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

If fee payment is enclosed, this amount is believed to be correct. However, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

Any additional fee(s) necessary to effect the proper and timely filing of the accompanying-papers may also be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.